

Recenzió

Haase Zsófia

**András Kertész & Csilla Rákosi (eds.):
 New Approaches to Linguistic Evidence. Pilot Studies.
 Neue Ansätze zu linguistischer Evidenz. Pilotstudien.**

Frankfurt: Lang, 2008. (MetaLinguistica; Bd. 22)

„The future of linguistics is likely to be determined by methodological issues [...]” (p. 9). In accordance with the view of Geeraerts on the future of linguistic research, the papers included in this volume represent work in progress and correspond to the initial phase of the project *The problem of evidence in theoretical linguistics*, coordinated by the Research Group for Theoretical Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences at the Universities of Debrecen, Szeged and Pécs. The project started in 2007. Thus, the present volume is the outcome of the work on the project as it has been carried out in the first year.

The introduction by András Kertész and Csilla Rákosi gives an outline of the project as a whole, the present book and the most important findings of the studies included in this volume, that may motivate the model of linguistic data and evidence the project focuses on. The first part of the volume consists of a series of state-of-the-art studies while the second part includes three case studies.

The first section of the introduction deals with the problems the present project is concerned with. As a point of departure, the central idea providing the basis for the project is summarised, after which the problems are formulated explicitly.

In the past century there was a series of methodological debates centring around the problem of empiricalness of linguistic theories. Although this problem was tackled from different perspectives, all of these earlier debates focused primarily on abstract methodological issues. Recent works on the topic, however, direct their attention to another aspect of the empiricalness problem, namely, the nature of linguistic data and evidence as it is present in different linguistic theories. As the evaluation of linguistic theories depends heavily on the kind of data that can be regarded as evidence either for or against their hypotheses, one of the most fundamental problems of contemporary linguistics can be formulated as follows:

- (P1) (a) What types of data do linguistic theories use, and what types of data should they use;
 (b) what data do they consider as evidence, and what data should be considered as such; and
 (c) what functions do they attribute to the latter, and what function should evidence be attributed to? (p. 10)

As mentioned above, earlier debates captured the problem of empiricalness mostly in the form of abstract philosophical issues. As opposed to this, the practice of linguistic theory-formation and concrete problems form the centre of attention for some of the authors of the recent works.

The present project lies between the two extremes outlined above. On the one hand, it regards the structure of linguistic data/evidence and their role in linguistic theories as a metatheoretical problem, for the solution of which metatheoretical tools are needed. Raising and solving (P2) is therefore considered a prerequisite for solving (P1). (P2) is formulated in the following way:

(P2) In what kind of metatheoretical framework can (P1) be solved? (p. 10)

On the other hand, it is emphasised that the metatheoretical discussion be in accordance with the everyday practice of linguistic theorising. Thus, the aim of the research project is to try to find a solution to (P1) via (P2) keeping in mind the two requirements mentioned above.

The present project stands out among the current approaches to data and evidence in linguistics in two respects. First, it attempts to establish a novel metatheoretical model of linguistic data and evidence (solving (P2)) which is hoped to be capable of providing a possible solution to (P1). The hypothesis put forward as a solution to (P2) is this:

(H) (P1) can be solved with the help of a specific model of *plausible argumentation* (p. 11)

This model assumes that 1. the heuristic process of raising and solving problems goes hand in hand with the structure of linguistic theories, 2. linguistic theories are processes of plausible argumentation, 3. there is no distinction between the context of discovery and the context of justification, 4. the whole of the argumentation process has to be focused on, involving the construction, the application and the testing of hypotheses. It is this hypothesis that the project will motivate and work out in detail.

Secondly, the novelty of the present project also manifests itself in it involving a series of case studies from very different fields of linguistics with the help of which the solution to (P1) by the application of (H) can be generalised. These case studies have three functions. First, their task is to reveal those aspects of linguistic data and evidence that the later elaboration of the model should capture. Second, they are regarded as the basis for the generalisations on which the model to be developed should be built. Third, after the construction of the model, the case studies would function as tests of the solution the model provides for (P1).

After the introduction that outlines the project in general, the subsequent parts of the volume present four studies concerning the state of the art and three case studies. It is pointed out that these papers are pilot studies preparing later considerations and arguing for the reasonability of the central idea of the project. In this initial phase of the project the studies attempt to shed light on the range of possible solutions to (P1) without raising (P2). The elaboration of the metatheoretical framework within which (P1) can be solved will be dealt with in future phases of the research.

Part I consists of four state-of-the-art studies that critically analyse current views on data and evidence in linguistics.

The first study by Kertész and Rákosi (*Daten und Evidenz in linguistischen Theorien: Ein Forschungsüberblick*) analyses the answers given to (P1) in the latest literature. It is shown

that all the approaches that are analysed in the paper are characterised by two kinds of double-facedness. First, despite maintaining methodological prejudices concerning the structure and function of data and evidence in linguistic theory-formation, these approaches also provide relevant and innovative insights by shedding fresh light on the phenomenon under consideration. Second, although the necessity of metascientific reflection is realised by all the approaches analysed, all of them still stick to the standard view of the analytic philosophy of science, not recognising the need for an alternative metascientific perspective. The authors conclude that the elaboration of a new metascientific approach cannot be avoided if linguistic data and evidence wants to be accounted for adequately. Consequently, the progressive points of the approaches analysed in this paper should be considered as points of departure for the establishment of a new metatheoretical model of linguistic data and evidence.

The second paper by Kertész and Rákosi (*Conservatism vs. innovation in the (un)grammaticality debate*) is devoted to an analysis of a controversy concerning the views of Geoffrey Sampson, who challenges the notion of grammaticality as used in generative grammar and argues for corpus data serving as better evidence in linguistics than introspective data. Sampson's claims made many linguists to comment on and dispute the topic. Analysing this controversy, the authors point out that on the one hand, some of the contributions to this debate are in certain respects more innovative than the views analysed in the first study. On the other hand, however, most participants of this debate stick more strongly to methodological prejudices than the views dealt with in the previous paper. The most innovative insights of this debate are summed up as follows: the cyclic argumentation process labelled as reflective equilibrium in the spirit of Goodman, the subjectivity, the unreliability and the uncertainty of all kinds of data.

The third state-of-the-art study by Kertész and Rákosi (*Conservatism vs. innovation in the debate on data in generative grammar*) deals with another controversy surrounding Sam Featherston's target article. In this article Featherston challenges grammaticality judgements from a different perspective than Sampson. His aim is to improve research based on grammaticality judgements by making the treatment of introspective data in generative linguistics more reliable. The reactions of generative grammarians to this debate are approving and/or critical. Kertész and Rákosi's study comes to the conclusion that the contributions have both conservative and innovative components. In this sense, they do not differ much from those analysed in the two previous studies. The most important innovative insights of the debate are the following: reference to non-linear relationship between data and theory; weakening of the notion of evidence; inconsistency as a possible driving force of linguistic theorising; and the multidimensionality of introspective data and the combination of different methods.

The fourth paper by Péter Csátár (*Die introspektiv-intuitive Datensammlung und ihre Alternativen in der konzeptuellen Metapherntheorie*) considers the data/evidence problem from the point of view of cognitive semantics. The author argues that the technique of data collection of conceptual metaphor theory is highly problematic as it uses only introspection (native speakers' metalinguistic intuitions) for this purpose. He maintains that other data sources should also be used in order to identify metaphors. The author chooses Steen's model of metaphor analysis and novel data collection techniques, which is one of the proposed solutions to the problem, and makes this the subject matter of his considerations. Csátár concludes that a combination of different data collection techniques is necessary for metaphor identification, and this multidimensionality of data also complies with the interdisciplinary nature of metaphor research.

Following the state-of-the-art studies, which take a critical look at the current views on the data/evidence problem in linguistics, Part II includes three case studies which highlight how the insights which the state-of-the-art studies have revealed may motivate novel and more sophisticated solutions to the particular linguistic problems investigated.

The first case study by Enikő Tóth and Csilla Rákosi (*Multiple data sources in semantics: A case study on mood choice in Hungarian complement clauses*) is an illustration of one of the central topics of the data/evidence problem that has been raised in the state-of-the-art studies. The authors address the question of whether introspective data can be complemented or substituted by experimental data. In order to find an answer to this problem, the authors examine Hungarian complement clauses where two morphologically identical moods may be used, including comparison of minimal pairs of contexts, where both are grammatical. The main finding of the study is that the conclusions the authors have come to could not have been obtained by using introspection as the sole technique of data collection.

Another important issue also mentioned in the first state-of-the-art article by Kertész and Rákosi is elaborated on in the next study by Katalin Nagy C. entitled *Data in historical pragmatics: A case study on the Catalan periphrastic perfective past*. In this paper the author considers some aspects of the data problem in historical pragmatics, namely that there are types of linguistic data/evidence which are not reproducible. She analyses data use in her investigation into the grammaticalisation of the Catalan *anar* 'to go' + infinitive construction. The paper concludes that the data problem in historical pragmatics can be resolved if the data sources are continuously broadened. The author suggests many possible ways of obtaining data from other sources (analyses of contemporary language use, inclusion of further data from other languages, etc.).

The last case study by Kertész and Rákosi (*Daten und Argumentation in der Theorie der konzeptuellen Metaphern*) takes the factors into consideration that determine whether the relationship between the data and the hypotheses of a given theory is grounded in fallacious or plausible argumentation. Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory has been charged with circularity as regards the relation between the data and the hypotheses. The paper addresses the problem of whether this charge is justified, i.e. whether the relationship between the data and the hypotheses in Lakoff and Johnson's theory is based on circular argumentation. If the answer were affirmative, it would be a very serious objection against the conceptual metaphor theory. The authors attempt to find an answer to the problem in three steps. First, they show that a metatheoretical framework is necessary in order to be able to define fallacies and demarcate fallacies from plausible argumentation. Second, they propose an approach to plausible argumentation. This metatheoretical framework, to the establishment of which the findings of the state-of-the-art studies have contributed, can be considered as the forerunner of the specific model of plausible argumentation mentioned with respect to (H) above. Third, with the help of the refined definition of circularity that has been provided by the framework the authors conclude that conceptual metaphor theory is based on a bidirectional, but not circular, relation between data and hypotheses. The authors argue, however, that the risk of the conceptual metaphor theory becoming circular is still involved in some respects, by which the theory also runs the risk of becoming ineffective.

Summing up, on the basis of what has been said above, it should be obvious that the project, the initial phase of which is documented in the present volume, is important because it addresses one of the most fundamental and most widely discussed problems of contemporary linguistics (P1): What data types do linguistic theories use, and which of these types are ac-

Haase Zsófia: András Kertész & Csilla Rákosi (eds.): New Approaches to Linguistic Evidence. Pilot Studies. Neue Ansätze zu linguistischer Evidenz. Pilotstudien. Argumentum, 5 (2009), 39-43 Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó (Debrecen)

knowledge as evidence? By presenting the first findings of the project, the aim of the present volume is to shed fresh light on this problem. The approaches to the central problem are original in four respects. First, the establishment of a metatheoretical framework is attempted, within which (P1) can be solved. Second, case studies help to motivate and test the workability of the metatheoretical model. Third, the project focuses on linguistic argumentation rather than the abstract structure of theories. Finally, the metatheoretical model can also serve as a contribution to the furthering of linguistic inquiry itself. The insights the studies included in this volume have revealed on the structure and the function of data can be considered as points of departure for an adequate metatheoretical model of linguistic data and evidence to emerge in the forthcoming phases of the project. The way the findings of the volume may motivate such a model will be dealt with in the immediate continuations of the present volume.